

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 19, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 10-18, 20-23, 30-35 and 57 are currently pending and under examination, and Claims 1-9, 24-29 and 36-56 are withdrawn. By this Amendment, Claims 10, 15, 30 and 57 have been amended. The Applicants submit that no new matter is added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-18, 20-23, 30-35 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. It is noted that the claims have been amended to obviate the rejection.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 10-18, 20-23 and 57 - Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-18, 20-23 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,698,021, hereinafter "Amini") in view of Junkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,927,757, hereinafter "Junkins") and further in view of Maeno (U.S. Patent No. 5,283,644, hereinafter "Maeno"). To the extent the rejection remains applicable to the claims as amended, the Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

The Applicants submit that Amini, Junkins and Maeno, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for performing remote video audits via a computer having a processor, the method including at least the following combination of features: "creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items; selecting at least

one of the plurality of audit items; obtaining video information regarding the selected audit item, wherein the video information includes video stills; entering a classification for the selected audit item based on reviewing the video information; storing the selected audit item after the classification is entered; calculating, via the processor, an audit item compliance percentage for the selected audit item in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items; and calculating, via the processor, an overall compliance percentage for the audit based on an average of the audit item compliance percentages,” as recited in amended claim 10.

The Office Action, on page 6, admits that Amini fails to disclose “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in the claims and relies on Junkins to cure this deficiency.

Junkins, in the Abstract and col. 3, lines 30-67, discloses a “camera driven virtual workspace management” system where “a digital camera captures an input video stream comprising images of a surrounding environment limited by the field of view of the camera.” In addition, Junkins, in col. 3, lines 42-45, discloses “parameters that define a partial view of the virtual workspace are redefined based upon a result from motion analysis of the input video stream performed by the handheld computer during the processing.”

However, Junkins does not disclose or suggest “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in claim 10. Instead, Junkins, in col. 5, lines 33-36, discloses user applications in the system that represent “software applications which are executing on the computer system, such as a word processing application or a spreadsheet application.” Having a software application such as a

spreadsheet running on a computer, as shown in Junkins, does not disclose or suggest “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in claim 10. (Emphasis added), and neither does redefining a partial view of a virtual workspace based upon a result from motion analysis of the input video stream during processing, as also shown in Junkins, disclose or suggest “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in claim 10. (Emphasis added). It is submitted that Junkins does not disclose or suggest “creating an audit spreadsheet containing a plurality of audit items,” as recited in claim 10.

In addition, the Office Action, on pages 3 and 5-6, asserts Amini discloses “calculating a compliance percentage in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items (Amini: column 9, lines 35-47: binary logic represents a 0% or 100% compliance percentage of stored event video).”

Amini, in col. 9, lines 35-54, discloses “an event-driven recording scheme” and “to facilitate this form of event-driven processing, the event processing selection parameter in the configuration file is set of an affirmative state (e.g., “Y”).” Setting a parameter to “an affirmative state (e.g., “Y”)” does not disclose or suggest calculating “an audit item compliance percentage for the selected audit item in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items; and calculating, via the processor, an overall compliance percentage for the audit based on an average of the audit item compliance percentages,” as recited in amended claim 10,” as recited in claim 10.

In addition, Amini, in col. 9, lines 61-64, discloses, “the detection of a change in state (e.g., low to high) of an event variable prompts camera server...to notify Image

Capture Application 510 of the occurrence of the event." (Emphasis added). However, changing a "state (e.g., low to high) of an event variable" does not disclose or suggest "calculating a compliance percentage," as recited in claim 10. Therefore, Amini does not disclose or suggest "calculating, via the processor, an audit item compliance percentage for the selected audit item in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items; and calculating, via the processor, an overall compliance percentage for the audit based on an average of the audit item compliance percentages," as recited in amended claim 10.

Maeno fails to disclose the above features, and therefore, fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Amini and Junkins.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit that amended claim 10 is allowable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination. For similar reasons, the Applicants submit that amended claims 15 and 57 are also allowable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

As claims 10, 15 and 57 are allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 11-14 and 16-23, which depend from allowable claims 10 and 15, respectively, are likewise allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Claims 30-35 - Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amini in view of Maeno. To the extent the rejection remains applicable to the claims as amended, the Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows.

The Applicants submit that Amini and Maeno, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for performing remote video guard tours via a computer

having a processor, the method including at least the following combination of features: “selecting a guard tour from a list of available guard tours; obtaining image information for a next stop on the selected guard tour, wherein the image information includes video stills; reviewing the image information; entering a classification for the guard tour stop based on the review; storing the selected audit item after the classification is entered; calculating, via the processor, a guard tour compliance percentage for the selected audit item in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items; and calculating, via the processor, an overall compliance percentage for the audit based on an average of the guard tour compliance percentages,” as recited in amended claim 30.

As discussed above, Amini does not disclose or suggest “calculating, via the processor, a guard tour compliance percentage for the selected audit item in one or more reports based on the classification of one or more such stored audit items; and calculating, via the processor, an overall compliance percentage for the audit based on an average of the guard tour compliance percentages,” as recited in amended claim 30.

Maeno fails to disclose the above features, and therefore, fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Amini.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit that amended claim 30 is allowable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

As claim 30 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 31-35, which depend from allowable claim 30, are likewise allowable over the cited references, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 024478-00023.

Respectfully submitted,



Tiffany J. Brooks
Registration Number 57,912

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

TJB:elp